

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

STEVEN STANDIFER,	)	8:12CV176
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
BROADMOOR DEVELOPMENT,	)	
INC., et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

STEVEN STANDIFER,	)	8:12CV177
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
BROADMOOR DEVELOPMENT,	)	
INC., et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**MEMORANDUM  
AND ORDER**

This matter is before the court on its own motion. On June 11, 2012, the court concluded that Case Numbers 8:12CV176 and 8:12CV177 involved common questions of law and fact, and consolidated them in the interest of expedition and economy. (Case No. 8:12CV177, Filing No. [9](#).) In doing so, the court directed Plaintiff to file an amended complaint in Case Number 8:12CV176 that contains all of Plaintiff's claims, including those presented in Case Number 8:12CV177. (*Id.* at CM/ECF pp. 3-4.) The court informed Plaintiff that in the event that he filed an amended complaint in accordance with the June 11, 2012, Memorandum and Order, the court would dismiss Case Number 8:12CV177. (*Id.*) On July 11, 2012, Plaintiff filed a Response, which the court liberally construes as an amended complaint, in Case Number 8:12CV176. (Case No. 8:12CV176, Filing No. [8](#).) Accordingly,

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff's Complaint in Case Number 8:12CV177 (case no. 8:12CV177, filing no. [1](#)) is dismissed without prejudice in accordance with the court's June 11, 2012, Memorandum and Order.

2. All further pleadings shall be filed in Case Number 8:12CV176.

3. A separate judgment will be entered in accordance with this Memorandum and Order.

DATED this 13th day of July, 2012.

BY THE COURT:

*s/ John M. Gerrard*  
United States District Judge

---

\*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.